

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5, 9, and 11 remain in the application with claims 1 and 9 having been amended hereby. Claim 6 has been canceled hereby without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 2, 7, 8, and 10 have been previously canceled. Claims 1 and 9 are in independent form.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1, 3-5, 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpalatable over Watanabe et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,084,888) in view of Wang, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,999,535).

In the present invention, payload data of each wireless packet is divided into one or more information units. The information unit is therefore a quantity of payload data that may be less than a single packet. When there is an error in transmission, each information unit having an error may be retransmitted. It is therefore not necessary to retransmit an entire packet due to an error in an information unit.

Moreover, after the first information unit is carried out, a determination may be made as to whether to continue to process the remaining information units of the payload. In so doing, an early opportunity is introduced to abort processing the payload without having to process the payload to completion when the payload is not desired.

Watanabe et al. does not divide the packet payload into one or more information units. The Examiner contends that the "transmission frame" of Watanabe et al. corresponds to the information units of the present invention. However, the information unit of the present invention is defined as a portion of the payload having a predefined length. The transmission frame of Watanabe et al. is a packet that includes the preamble, frame control, frame header, header part, frame payload part and payload part all combined. Therefore the transmission frame appears to more closely correspond to the wireless packet of the present invention. Accordingly, Watanabe et al. does not teach anything corresponding to the information frame of the present invention. Therefore Watanabe et al. does not teach that data can be resent at the information frame level. In Watanabe et al., data must be resent at the whole packet level. Additionally, Watanabe et al. does not teach that an opportunity to continue payload processing occurs after the carrying out of the first information unit. In Watanabe et al., the entire payload must be received whether it is desired or not.

These features are also not taught or suggested in Wang et al., nor does the Examiner contend that they are. Because these features are present in each claim, as amended hereby, it is believed that claims 1, 3-5, 9 and 11 are patentable over the

cited art.

Therefore, by reason of the amendments made to the claims hereby, as well as the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that wireless transmitting method and apparatus, as taught by the present invention and as recited in the amended claims, is neither shown nor suggested in the cited references.

The references cited as of interest have been reviewed and are not seen to show or suggest the present invention as recited in the amended claims.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

COOPER & DUNHAM LLP



Jay H. Maioli
Reg. No. 27, 213

JHM/JBG